



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

# Classical Philology

VOLUME IX

July 1914

NUMBER 3

## A NEW FRAGMENT OF THE DECREE OF CHREMONIDES

BY KENDALL K. SMITH

Among the new fragments gathered by Mr. Kirchner into his first revised volume of Attic inscriptions (*Inscriptiones Graecae*, Voluminis II et III Editio Minor, Pars Prima, Fasciculus Prior, 1913) is one which was discovered on the Acropolis in 1910 (No. 686), and known to the editor only through the copy and other information sent from Athens by Mr. Skias. It contains the beginnings of 34 lines, whose restoration can be effected by using from 46 to 49 letters in a line, written approximately stoichedon. The content is clear: the first 23 lines form the conclusion of a decree of the Athenian state arranging for co-operation with Areus, king of Sparta, and Sparta's allies against Antigonos II (Gonatas); the space of one line is left vacant, and then the last 11 lines contain incomplete articles of alliance.

It was naturally recognized that the matters referred to were connected with the provisions of the decree of Chremonides passed in the Athenian Ecclesia on the ninth of Metageitnion, 266 B.C.—the next document in the *Corpus* (No. 687), as arranged by Mr. Kirchner. His own words on this point are, "Hoc decretum," i.e., the new fragment, "paullo ante id quod sequitur factum esse facile perspicitur. Nam vocibus psephismatis t. 687, 20 καὶ (ὁ δῆμος) τοὺς λοιποὺς Ἑλληνας ἐψήφισται παρακαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν προαίρεσιν (sc. συμμαχίας) respiciuntur v. 1 sq. huius decreti. Porro quae illic leguntur v. 27, καὶ πρέσβεις ἀπὸ τῶν συνέδρων ἀπεστάλκασι (οἱ

[CLASSICAL PHILOLOGY IX, July, 1914] 225

Λακεδαιμόνιοι) πρὸς τὸν δῆμον referenda sunt ad ea quae supra exstant v. 10, τοὺς πρέσβεις τοὺς ἤκοντας παρ' αὐτῶν." Mr. Kirchner's conclusion is, "Titulum una cum insequenti exaratum et publice propositum esse existimo. Hoc inde colligitur quod et uterque lapis eandem manum indicat eiusdemque longitudinis versus habet et quod huic titulo foederis formula addita est, quam antequam foedus iure iurando (t. 687, 51 sq.) sancitum esset, lapidi incidi non potuisse apparet."

As Mr. Kirchner remarks, the two documents are written in the same hand, on the same kind of marble, and in lines of equal length. He might have added, what his lemmata show, that the slabs are of equal thickness. But, quite apart from these considerations, a reading of the new fragment must compel one to conclude that the editor has not gone far enough. The language points unmistakably in the same direction as the hand-writing, material, etc. These are not preliminary, but completed negotiations. The *σύνεδροι* are not to discuss alliance but to represent Athens in the Congress of the Allies, of whom Athens must already have become one: *χειροτονῆσαι δὲ καὶ συνέδρους δύο τὸν δῆμον αὐτίκα μάλα ἐξ Ἀθηναίων ἀπάντων οἵτινες μετὰ τε Ἀρέως καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν συμμάχων ἀποστελλομένων συνέδρων βουλευσονται περὶ τῶν κοινῆι συμφερόντων.*

Better proof of this is found in the fact that the alliance itself appears on the new stone. Mr. Kirchner's assumption that these are separate documents forces him to the awkward theory that the earlier decree was not actually inscribed until after the passage of the later one, and that then, with the alliance ratified, the articles were added below the earlier one, for some unknown reason, in the wrong place. They ought to be on the stone which decrees the alliance. The decree above them ought to be part of the motion of Chremonides.

Apparently, these arguments dash themselves against a solid wall of fact. You cannot add to what is already complete. Such is asserted to be the case with the Chremonidean decree. In Mr. Kirchner's lemma the formula of completeness is expressed as follows: "Fr. *a* = II, 332 + fr. *b* = II, 332 (*sic*)<sup>1</sup> + fr. *c* = II, 5, 510d. *Fragmenta tria marmoris Hymettii, quae coniunxit Wilhelm.*" The

<sup>1</sup>This is an error for II, 333.

fragments themselves at first glance bear out this statement. They give the beginning of the document and the end. Their only vulnerable point is the joint between fragment *a*, on the one hand, and fragments *b* and *c*, on the other. Before the discovery of the fitting of *c* to *b*, fragments *a* and *b* were printed together and the lines were numbered continuously (Dittenberger, *Syll.*<sup>2</sup>, 214; Roberts-Gardner, 57). It seems to have been assumed that Wilhelm's addition of *c* helped to cement the juncture, even though by projecting above *b* it compelled *b* to drop a line lower than before. At all events, some such preconception must have prevented the consideration of 686 as a part of 687.

None of the editors has ever actually affirmed that the stones *b*, *c* join *a* by contact-surfaces. Wilhelm wrote of *a* and *b* (*Ath. Mitth.*, XVII [1892], 194), "ich kann auf Grund einer kuerzlich vorgenommenen Pruefung versichern, dass in dem von mir ergaenzten Bruchstuecke thatsaechlich der Schlussteil der Urkunde CIA II, 332 vorliegt." His only statement with regard to *c* is, "An das von mir . . . mit CIA II, 332 verbundene Bruchstueck II, 333 passt IV, 2, 510*d* links an" (*Goett. Gel. Anz.* [1903], 789). The assumption that all three fragments are inseparably connected may rest on these words. But Wilhelm's real statement is merely that fragments *b*, *c* are from the same stone as fragment *a*.

Therefore, it is after *a*, if anywhere, that the new stone must fit. This is also borne out by the contents of 686. They make a perfect continuation of 687*a*. In fragment *a* we read the resolution authorizing the alliance, and directions for its being inscribed on a bronze tablet which is to be set up beside the temple of Athena Polias on the Acropolis. The concluding lines prescribe that "the magistrates shall give to the ambassadors present from the Allies the oath respecting the alliance." The fragmentary words at the beginning of 686 deal with "taking oaths," presumably from the Allies. Then follows the provision for the election of commissioners to the Congress, and after this, expressions of esteem to the two ambassadors from the Allies and the routine prescription for the engraving of the decree on a marble stele.

Without the addition of this new material there is no commendation of the ambassadors and no provision for inscribing the document

on the marble slab which we have preserved. The words in *a*, 42, *ἀναγράψαι αὐτήν*, etc., refer only to the articles of alliance; which is also true of the concluding lines of *b*. The latter, furthermore, do not deal solely with this particular slab but with those erected by each of the Allies in "whatever sanctuary they please." The point of this seems to have passed unnoticed. This is the language of the instrument itself, as proposed to the various states. Indeed, repeating as they do the last provision in *a*, regarding the oaths of the Athenians, in addition to the directions for engraving, fragments *b* and *c* are plainly part of the original terms submitted to the Athenian Ecclesia and the basis for the language of the motion of Chremonides. In other words *b*, *c* are not a continuation of *a* at all, but of 686, where, as has already been stated, articles of alliance occupy the second half of the stone.

The above arguments prove that 687 can be divided, that 686 contains material which 687 ought to have, and that the contents of 686 logically fit between the two halves of 687. Fortunately, the case does not have to rest there. Through the kindness and interest of Mr. W. S. Ferguson, visiting professor at the American School of Classical Studies at Athens, and the hearty co-operation of Mr. Leonardos, ephor of the Epigraphical Museum, it has been possible for me to test my conclusions by the stones themselves. The new fragment was brought from the Acropolis and placed beside 687*a* in the Museum. "The juxtaposition of the two," writes Mr. Ferguson, "showed at a glance that your idea as to the relation of the two is entirely correct. The squeeze which I herewith enclose reveals only the mode of contact of the upper surface of the two fragments; it does not reveal the perfect juncture which the middle and lower portions make. As to the connection of the two there can be no question whatsoever; . . . the tapering as well as the color and grain of the stone show (if further proof were needed) that 686 and 687 are parts of the same document." Such confirmation as this is final. There can no longer be any doubt that 686 is the central portion of the decree of Chremonides.

As to *c*, *b*, Mr. Ferguson writes, "If I had instruments of precision, I think I might be able to determine the position of fragments *c*, *b* in the entire stone; for the stone tapers slightly from top to bottom.

I made a rough computation in the museum but my eye was about my only guide. I should say, however, that very little is lost between them and the new fragment."

The accompanying transcript presents the inscription constituted on the basis of these new facts. It will be seen on comparison with the *Corpus* that I have attempted much more in the way of restoration than Mr. Kirchner. In this I have received valuable suggestions from Mr. Ferguson, whose generous labors in my behalf must be apparent to all who read this article. I have indicated his restorations in the notes by the letter F. A few of the readings in the *Corpus* have been replaced by others of my own. In all such cases I have given the older reading in my commentary and marked it by the letter K. The letter S indicates my restorations when I have commented on them in the notes. Most of these, however, can be seen immediately by comparing the following copy with the copy in the *Corpus*.

- α ⊙ ε ο [ι].  
 Ἐπὶ Πειθιδήμου ἀρχοντος ἐπὶ τῆς Ἐρεχθείδος δευτέρας π-  
 [ρ]υταείας·  
 Μεταγειτνήωνος ἐνάτει ἰσταμένον, ἐνάτει τῆς πρυτανεί-  
 5 ας· ἐκκλησία κυρία· τῶν προέδρων ἐπεψήφισεν Σώστρατος K-  
 αλλιστράτου Ἐρχιεὺς καὶ συμπρόεδροι· υ υ ἔδοξεν τῷ δή-  
 μῳ· υ υ Χρεμωνίδης Ἐτεοκλέους Αἰθαλίδης εἶπεν· ἐπειδὴ  
 πρότερον μὲν Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι καὶ οἱ σύμμαχοι  
 10 οἱ ἑκατέρων φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν κοινὴν ποιησάμενοι  
 πρὸς ἑαυτοὺς πολλοὺς καὶ καλοὺς ἀγῶνας ἠγωνίσαντο με-  
 τ' ἀλλήλων πρὸς τοὺς καταδουλοῦσθαι τὰς πόλεις ἐπιχειροῦ-  
 σήντας, ἐξ ὧν ἑαυτοῖς τε δόξαν ἐκτήσαντο καὶ τοῖς ἀλλ[ο]ις  
 Ἑλλησιν παρεσκεύασαν τὴν ἐλευθερίαν· καὶ νῦν δὲ κ[α]ίρω  
 15 καθειληφότων ὁμοίων τὴν Ἑλλάδα πᾶσαν διὰ το[υ]ς κ[α]ταλύει-  
 ν ἐπιχειροῦντας τοὺς τε νόμους καὶ τὰς πατρίους ἐκάστο-  
 υς πολιτείας ὃ τε βασιλεὺς Πτολεμαῖος ἀκολουθῶν τῆ τ-  
 ῶν προγόνων καὶ τῆ ἀδελφῆς προ[α]ίρεσει φανερός ἐστ-  
 20 ιν σπουδάζων ὑπὲρ τῆς κοινῆς τ[ῶν] Ἑλλήνων ἐλευθερίας· καὶ  
 ὁ δῆμος ὁ Ἀθηναίων συμμαχίαν ποιησάμενος πρὸς αὐτὸν καὶ  
 τοὺς λοιποὺς Ἑλληνας ἐψήφισται παρακαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν  
 25 προαίρεσιν· ὥσαύτως δὲ καὶ Λακεδαιμόνιοι φίλοι καὶ σύμμαχοι  
 τοῦ βασιλέως ὄντες Πτολεμαίου καὶ πρὸς τὸν δῆμον τ-  
 ὸν Ἀθηναίων εἰσὶν ἐψηφισμένοι συμμαχίαν μετὰ τε Ἡλείων  
 καὶ Ἀχαιῶν καὶ Τεγεατῶν καὶ Μαντινέων καὶ Ὀρχομενίων κα-  
 ῖ Φια[λέων] καὶ Καφυέων καὶ Κρηταέων ὅσοι εἰσὶν ἐν τῇ συμμ-

- [αχίαι τ]εῖ Λακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀρέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων  
 [ν καὶ] πρέσβεις ἀπὸ τῶν συνέδρων ἀπεστάλακσιν πρὸς τὸν δῆ-  
 [μον] καὶ οἱ παραγεγονότες παρ' αὐτῶν ἐμφανίζουσιν τὴν τε Λα-  
 30 ακεδαιμονίων καὶ Ἀρέως καὶ τῶν ἄλλων συμμάχων φιλοτιμί-  
 αν, ἣν ἔχουσιν πρὸς τὸν δῆμον, καὶ τὴν περὶ τῆς συμμαχίας ὁμο-  
 ογίαν ἣκουσι κομίζοντες· ὅπως ἂν οὖν κοινῆς ὁμονοίας γενο-  
 μένης τοῖς Ἕλλησι πρὸς τε τοὺς νῦν ἡδικηκότας καὶ παρεσπον-  
 δηκότας τὰς πόλεις πρόθυμοι μετὰ τοῦ βασιλέως Πτολεμαίου  
 καὶ μετ' ἄλλῶν ὑπάρχων ἀγωνισταὶ καὶ τὸ λοιπὸν μεθ' ὁμο-  
 35 οίας σωίζωσιν τὰς πόλεις· *v v v* ἀγαθῆι τύχει δεδόχθαι τῶ[ι δ]-  
 ἡμῶι τὴν μὲν φιλίαν καὶ τὴν συμμαχίαν εἶναι Ἀθηναίοις [καὶ]  
 Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν τοῖς Λακεδαιμονί[ων]  
 καὶ Ἡλείοις καὶ Ἀχαιοῖς καὶ Τεγεαταῖς καὶ Μαντινεῦσ[ιν κα]-  
 ἰ Ὀρχομενίοις καὶ Φιαλεῦσιν καὶ Καφνεῦσιν καὶ Κρητ[αεῦσι]-  
 40 ν ὅσοι ἐν τεί συμμαχία εἰσὶν τεῖ Λακεδαιμονίων κα[ὶ] Ἀρέως  
 καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις συμμάχοις κυρίαν εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα [χρόνον, ἣν]  
 ἦκουσι κομίζοντες οἱ πρέσβεις· καὶ ἀναγράψαι αὐτῆν τὸν γρ]-  
 αμματέα τὸν κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν ἐν στήλῃ χαλκ[ῆ] καὶ στήθαι ἐ]-  
 ν ἀκροπόλει παρὰ τὸν νεῶ τῆς Ἀθηναῖς τῆς Ἰσολιάδος· ὁμοῦσαι δὲ]  
 45 [τὰ] ἀρχαία τοῖς πρέσβεσιν τοῖς παραγεγο[νόσιν παρ' αὐτῶν τὸ]  
 [ν ὄρκον τὸ]ν περὶ τῆς συμμαχίας κατὰ τὰ[ς συνθήκας· τοὺς δὲ χε]-  
 (686) *d* [φο]τοῦ[ῖ] θέντας] ὑπὸ τοῦ δήμου πρ[εσβ]ε[ῖ]ν αὐτίκα οἷτινες το]-  
 [ῦς ὄρκους ἀπολ]ήψονται παρὰ τῶ[ν λοιπῶν Ἕλληνων· *v v* χειροτο]-  
 [ν]ῆσαι δὲ καὶ συνέδρους [δύο τὸν δῆμον αὐτίκα μάλα ἐξ Ἀθηναίω]-  
 50 ν ἀπάντων οἷτινες μετὰ τε Ἀρέως [καὶ τῶν ἀπὸ τῶν συμμάχων ἀ]-  
 ποστελλομένων συνέδρων βουλευόντ[αι περὶ τῶν κοινῆ] συ]-  
 μφερόντων· μερίζειν δὲ τοῖς αἰρεθείσ[ιν τοὺς ἐπὶ τῆ] διοικ]-  
 ῆσει εἰς ἐφόδια οὗ ἂν χρόνον ἀποδημῶ[σιν ὅ] τι ἂν διαχειροτο]-  
 νοῦντι δόξει τῶι δήμῳ· ἐπαινεῖσαι δὲ τοὺς ἐφόρους Λακεδα]-  
 55 μονίων καὶ Ἀρέα καὶ τοὺς συμμάχους [καὶ στεφανῶσαι αὐτοὺς]  
 χρυσῶι στεφάνῳ κατὰ τὸν νόμον· ἐπ[αινεῖσαι δὲ καὶ τοὺς πρέσ]-  
 βεις τοὺς ἦκοντας παρ' αὐτῶν *v* Θεομ[- - - - Λακεδα]-  
 μόνιον *v v* Ἀργεῖον Κλεινίου Ἡλείο[ν *v* καὶ στεφανῶσαι ἐκάτ]-  
 ερον αὐτῶν χρυσῶι στεφάνῳ κατὰ [τὸν νόμον φιλοτιμίας ἐνε]-  
 60 κα καὶ εὐνοίας ἧς ἔχουσιν περ[ὶ] τε τοὺς ἄλλους συμμάχους κα]-  
 ἰ τὸν δῆμον τὸν Ἀθηναίων· εἶνα[ι] δὲ ἐκατέρῳ αὐτῶν καὶ ἄλλο ἀγ]-  
 αθὸν εὐρέσθαι παρὰ τῆς βουλ[ῆς καὶ τοῦ δήμου ἕαν] του δοκῶσιν]  
 ἀξιοὶ εἶναι· καλέσαι δὲ αὐτ[οὺς] καὶ ἐπὶ ξένια εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖ]-  
 ον εἰς αὔριον· ἀναγράψαι δὲ [καὶ τὸδε τὸ ψήφισμα τὸν γραμματέ]-  
 65 α τὸν κατὰ πρυτανεῖαν εἰστ[ήλην λιθίνην καὶ τὰς συνθήκας κα]-  
 ἰ στήσαι ἐν ἀκροπόλει, εἰς [δὲ τὴν ἀναγραφὴν τε καὶ ἀνάθεσιν τ]-  
 ῆς στήλης μερίσαι τοὺς ἐπ[ὶ] τῆ] διοικήσει τὸ ἀνύλωμα ὃ ἂν γέν]-  
 ηται· *v v v* Σύνεδροι οἶδε κ[εχειροτόνηνται]·  
*v v v v* Κάλλιππος Ἐλευσί[ος - - - - - ]

*vacat spatium unius versus*

- 70 Σπονδαὶ καὶ συμμαχία [Λακεδαιμονίοις τε καὶ τοῖς συμμαχο]-  
 ις Λακεδαιμονίων πρὸς [Ἀθηναίους καὶ τοὺς συμμαχοῦς Ἀθην]-  
 αίων εἰς τὸν ἅπαντα [χρόνον. *v v* Ἐχειν τὴν ἑαυτῶν ἐλευθέρ]-  
 οὺς ὄντας καὶ αὐτο[νόμους, πολιτείας πολιτευομένους κατὰ]  
 τὰ πάτρια. εἰάν δέ τ[ις] εἶ ἐπὶ πολέμῳ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν Ἀθην]-  
 75 αίων ἢ τοὺς νόμο[υ]ς καταλύει Ἀθηναίων ἢ ἀδικεῖ τοὺς συμμα[χ]-  
 οὺς τοὺς Ἀθην[αίων, βοηθεῖν Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ συμμαχ]-  
 [ο]υ]ς τοὺς Λ[ακεδαιμονίων καθότι ἂν ἐπαγγέλλωσιν. εἰάν δέ τ]-  
 ις εἶ ἐπὶ π[ολέμῳ ἐπὶ τὴν χώραν τὴν Λακεδαιμονίων ἢ τοὺς]  
 νόμους κατ[αλύει Λακεδαιμονίων ἢ ἀδικεῖ τοὺς συμμαχοῦς Λ]-  
 80 ακεδαιμ[ονίων, βοηθεῖν Ἀθηναίους καὶ τοὺς συμμαχοῦς Ἀθην]-  
 [αίων καθότι ἂν ἐπαγγέλλωσιν. - - - - - ]  
 ..... ηδ ..... c  
 ..... Λακεδαιμονίου]s καὶ τοὺς συμμαχοῦς Ἀθηνα[ί]- b  
 [οις καὶ τοῖς συμμαχοῦς. *v v* ὁμο]σαι δὲ Ἀθηναίους μὲν Λακεδαι-  
 85 [μονίους καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ ἐκάστης] πόλει τοὺς στρατηγούς καὶ τ-  
 [ὴν βουλὴν τοὺς [Ἡ καὶ τοὺς ἄρ]χοντας καὶ φυλάρχους καὶ ταξι-  
 [άρχους τόνδε τὸν ὄρκον. *v* ὁμ]νύω Δία Γ[ῆ]ν Ἥλιον Ἄρη Ἀθηνᾶν Ἄρε-  
 [ίαν Ποσειδῶν Δῆμητραν. *v v* ἐ]μ[μ]ενεῖν ἐν τεί συμμαχίαι τεί γεγ-  
 [ενημένην. εὐορκοῦσιν μὲν] πολλ[ὰ] κα[ὶ] γαθά, ἐπιорκοῦσι δὲ τᾶνα-  
 90 [ντία. *v* Λακεδαιμονίους δὲ] Ἀθη[να]ίοις ὁμοσαι κατὰ ταῦτα τοῦ-  
 [ς βασιλεῖς καὶ τοὺς ἐφόρο]υς [καὶ] τοὺς γέροντας. κατὰ ταῦτα δ-  
 [ὲ ὁμοσαι καὶ κατὰ τὰ<τα>ς ἄλλας] πόλεις τοὺς ἄρχοντας. *v v* εἰάν δ-  
 [ὲ δοκῆι Λακεδαιμονίους καὶ τ]οῖς συμμαχοῦς καὶ Ἀθηναίους  
 [ἄμεινον εἶναι προσθεῖναι τι] καὶ ἀφελεῖν περὶ τῆς συμμαχι-  
 95 [ας ὃ ἂν δοκῆι ἀμφοτέροις, εὖ]ορκον εἶναι. ἀναγράψαι δὲ τὴν συ-  
 [μμαχίαν ἐν στήλαις χαλκαῖ]s καὶ στήσαι ἐν ἱερῶι ὅπου ἂν βού-  
 [λωνται].

*Line 46.*—TA [ΠΑΤΡΙΑ]. K., F. TA[Σ ΣΤΥΝΘΗΚΑΣ]. S. The form of oath to be taken by the Athenian officials is prescribed in the articles of alliance (lines 84–90). [ΤΟΥΣ ΔΕ ΗΔΗ ΧΕΙΡΟ- ΤΟΝ[ΗΘΕΝΤΑΣ], “I assume that men were already selected τοὺς λοιποὺς Ἕλληνας . . . παρακαλεῖν ἐπὶ τὴν αὐτὴν προαίρεσιν (lines 20 ff.).” F. ΗΔΗ must be omitted if ΚΑΤΑ ΤΑΣ ΣΤΥΝΘΗΚΑΣ stands.

*Line 47.*—ΠΡ[ΕΣΒ]Ε[ΥΤΕΙΝ]. “At present nothing is legible after ΠΡ, but this is due to a recent chipping of the stone. The indications all point to the correctness of Kirchner’s reading: ΠΡ[ΕΣΒ]Ε.” F. Older squeezes give the letter Ε. [ΕΛΕΣΘΑΙ ΔΕ ΠΡΕΣΒΕΙΣ ΠΕΝΤΕ (?)]. K. The last line of 687a is the first line of 686.



*Line 48.*—ΑΠΟΑ[ΗΨΟΜΕΝΟΤΣ]. K. ΤΩ[N ΛΟΙΠΩΝ ΕΛΛΗ-  
ΝΩΝ]. F. “The Ω is certain. The *Corpus* is wrong in writing O.  
What precedes may be a T, as Kirchner suggests. Nothing suits  
the indications better. The little slanting line of the preceding letter  
may be part of the curve of an omicron.” (F. thought of ΑΠΟ.)  
“Of the third letter beyond only the top is visible and that faintly.  
It may be the slightly chipped upper end of an iota; or it may be  
the upper point of an alpha, delta, or lambda. The iota is quite as  
good as any of the others.” F. The slanting line before T can  
very well be A. Although crowding seems necessary, ΠΑΡΑ, not  
ΑΠΟ, is the regular word in this idiom. I assume that the preceding  
ΑΙ occupy one space. I is a constantly disturbing factor in the  
alignment of this inscription. The spaces between letters in a hori-  
zontal direction seem to have occupied the mind of the letterer more  
than the vertical columns. Therefore, the narrow letter I frequently  
becomes an extra letter in the line. (See 687*a*, 18, 30, 33. For the first  
17 lines the number of letters is maintained at 46. With the combi-  
nation OI in the word ΚΟΙΝΗΣ of line 18 the letters begin to be set  
more and more to the left of the letters above them, until by the  
time ΕΛΛΗΝΩΝ is reached a letter has been added to the line,  
bringing the total up to 47. This number is kept until line 30 is  
reached. In the middle of this line 13 letters, ΚΑΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΣ,  
containing, it will be perceived, the letter I twice, are accommodated  
to the space of 12 letters ΤΩΝ ΑΛΛΩΝ ΣΤΜΜ, in which no I occurs.  
At the end of this line another letter is added, raising the total to  
49. Line 31 contains the same number, but not through following  
the alignment of the line preceding. The extra letter at the end is  
omitted and ΓΙ occupy the space of one letter at the beginning.  
The next line, 32, has only the single letter N under ΓΙ and, as the  
remainder follows the line above, this reduces the number of letters  
to 48. Both of these last two lines might well have been longer by a  
letter if it had not happened that the iotas and the closer spacing  
fell under one another. This did not happen in the next line, 33,  
which becomes a line of 49 letters by the setting of ΣΙ under O. Line  
34, having similar combinations with I at the same part of the line,  
contains the same number of letters; but in 35 a X under ΙΤ at this  
part of the line changes the number back to 48 again. No departure

from this figure appears in the remaining lines of the fragment although, as elsewhere, the stoichedon is only approximate.)

*Line 51.*—"The initial Π is legible on the stone." F.

*Line 52.*—ΑΙΠΕΘΕΙΣ[Ι]. K. ΑΙΠΕΘΕΙΣ[ΙΝ]. S. The N is commonly added in this inscription; one more letter is needed in the line.

*Line 56.*—"There is no vacant space before ΕΠ." F.

*Line 63.*—As restored in the *Corpus*, there is a sudden drop in the number of letters from 48 or 49, to 46. This can be avoided by the insertion of ΚΑΙ before ΕΠΙ ΞΕΝΙΑ.

*Line 64.*—On the stone appear not only the ψήφισμα but also the συνθήκαι. I understand the order to the Secretary to mention both, the latter in the lacuna in the next line which has never been filled out. This order of words is unusual but paralleled by *IG*, II<sup>2</sup>, 330, 25. These two parts may be bound together and a line of more suitable length obtained by the insertion of ΚΑΙ after ΑΝΑΓΡΑΨΑΙ ΔΕ.

*Line 65.*—[ΚΑΙ ΤΑΣ ΣΤΥΝΘΗΚΑΣ]. S. See preceding note.

*Line 67.*—ΕΠ[Ι ΤΗ ΔΙΟΙΚΗΣΕΙ ΟΣΟΝ ΑΝ ΤΩΙ ΔΗΜΩΙ ΦΑΙΝ]ΗΤΑΙ. K. This reading, hesitatingly proposed by Wilamowitz, gives a line of 52 letters. My reading, [ΤΟ ΑΝΑΛΩΜΑ Ο ΑΝ ΓΕΝ]ΗΤΑΙ, which is a substitute for the usual ΤΟ ΑΝΑΛΩΜΑ ΓΕΝΟΜΕΝΟΝ, gives a line of 49 letters.

*Lines 70-80.*—The *Corpus* is wrong in indicating that these lines are not written stoichedon. Lines 71 and 72 are the only exceptions to this arrangement. Mr. Ferguson offers the following explanation of the dislocation of letters here: "The stone-cutter omitted the second A of [Ἀακεδα]μονίων and partly erased the portion here enclosed in brackets, in order to make the correction. I fancy that he observed his error when he reached the ἅπαντα of line 72. This word is spread out so that its final A comes nearly under the O of πρόσ. The rest of the fragment is stoichedon." By this he means that the alignment established in 72 is thereafter maintained on this fragment. At first this crowding appears to be only another instance of the tendency commented upon in the note to line 48. But we have not only the erasure to explain but also the fact that the next line, which in the same space has the same number of iotas, is not aligned with it but with the line above, 70. Therefore, Mr. Ferguson's explanation is probably correct. I doubt whether

the spacing of ΑΠΑΝΤΑ should be connected with the erasure. It looks to me rather as if the combination ΙΩ in ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ above were responsible for the dropping of a letter in line 72 through the even spacing of this word ΑΠΑΝΤΑ.

*Line 70.*—[ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΙΣ ΚΑΙ]. K. My restorations are based upon a line normally 48 letters in length to correspond with both the preceding ψήφισμα and the final portions, fragments *c*, *b*, as restored in the *Corpus*.

*Line 71.*—ΠΡΟΣ [ΤΗΝ ΒΟΥΛΗΝ ΚΑΙ ΤΟΝ ΔΗΜΟΝ ΤΟΝ]. K.

*Lines 72-73.*—[Τ]ΟΤΣ ΟΝΤΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΑΤΤΟ[ΤΣ]. K. For my reading cf. *IG*, II<sup>2</sup>, 43, ἐξεῖναι ἀν[τ]ῶ[ι ἐλευθέρ]ωι ὄντι καὶ αὐτονόμωι, πολιτ[ενομέν]ωι πολιτείαν ἦν ἄν βόληται; and *IG*, II<sup>2</sup>, 44, ἔχε[ν τή]ν ἑαυτῶν Χαλκιδέ[ας ἐλ]ευθέρ[ος ὄντα]s καὶ αὐτονόμος. See also lines 14-16 of this inscription.

In the remainder of this fragment (through line 81) the restorations of the *Corpus* are restricted to completing the words on the edge of the fracture and to supplying the two phrases [κατὰ] τὰ πάτρια (73) and [ἐὰν δέ τ]ις (77). Otherwise the restorations are my own, based on the regular formulae. See Larfeld, *Griech. Epigraphik*, II, 727 ff.

*Lines 82 ff.*—I have been unable to combine these fragments with the last lines of the preceding. A close resemblance will be noticed between my restoration of 80 and the preserved words in 83. The combination of letters HA in my restoration ἡ ἀδικεῖ of line 79 also resembles the reported ΗΔ of line 82. But these similarities are probably accidental. At least, I have not been able to arrange the letters in lines 79 and 80 so that they shall fall two spaces to the left of their present position and thus coincide with the arrangement in lines 82 and 83. Perhaps this can be done. For the present, however, I understand a gap between lines 81 and 82.

*Line 87.*—[ΚΑΙ ΠΗΠΑΡΧΟΥΣ *v v*]. K. I have preferred ΤΟΝΔΕ ΤΟΝ ΟΡΚΟΝ before the asyndetic ΟΜΝΤΩ. This restoration leaves but one vacant space.

*Line 90.*—[ΛΑΚΕΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΩΝ]. K. I prefer partitive apposition to the partitive genitive because of the parallel construction in 84-86.

*Lines 95-96.*—ΣΤ[ΝΘΗΚΗΝ ΤΑΣ ΠΟΛΕΙΣ ΕΝ ΣΤΗΛΑΙΣ]. K. My reading is based on lines 42-43.